



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,819	03/11/2004	Eric D. Deily	MS1-1906US	7127
22801	7590	08/11/2008	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC			STACE, BRENT S	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500				
SPOKANE, WA 99201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/798,819	DEILY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BRENT STACE	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-14,16,18-24,26-33,35,36,38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-14,16,18-24,26-33,35,36,38 and 39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008. Claims 1, 3-14, 16, and 18-39 are pending. In the amendment filed June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008, Claims 1, 16, 32, 33, and 36 are amended, Claims 2, 15, 17, and 40 are canceled, and Claims 1, 16, 32, 33, and 36, independent Claims.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008 with respect to Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16, 18-24, 26-33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 have been fully considered but some are not persuasive.
4. The applicant's argue that a citing of Microsoft pages 1-8 is too large of a citing. Although the prior art is not complex or is very large (and the applicant should consider the reference as a whole), the examiner disagrees. However, the examiner has

modified some citings and rejections below to add clarity and to show a different interpretation of the references now being used to reject the pending claims.

5. Some of the Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Arguments of these nature will not have a response by the examiner at this time.

6. As to the applicant's arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including Claims 1, 16, 32, and 36) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting "determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate, as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity" the examiner respectfully disagrees. Microsoft, p. 5, bottom was used to reject this limitation. In the cited section(s) of Microsoft, Microsoft teaches that different levels of logging/tracing (showing page output with or without the trace.axd). These different modes of tracing (true/false) provide for different levels of verbosity in logging/tracing. Settings need to be changed in order for the different levels of tracing to be enabled (such as the configuration file (web.config) on page 5). Based on these settings, Microsoft determines whether or not to log/trace the occurrence of some events with the trace.axd. This is " determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate" while the settings themselves are "a function of a predetermined level of

verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity.” Microsoft, page 6 also teaches a “view details” link which can be construed as determining a level of verbosity by viewing additional details of requests made. As such, the cited sections of Microsoft appear to teach at least the limitations as claimed.

7. As to the applicant’s arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 7 (including Claim 24) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting “that the Web application interfaces with at least one said API (of the operating system)” the examiner respectfully disagrees. A definition of API as known by one of ordinary skill in the art is: “[Definition quoted from CNET] An API (Application Program Interface) is a series of functions that programs can use to make the operating system do their work. Using Windows APIs, for example, a program can open windows, files, and message boxes -- as well as perform more complicated tasks-- by passing a single instruction. Windows has several classes of APIs that deal with telephony, messaging, and other issues.” (obtained from <http://acts.nersc.gov/glossary.html>). The Microsoft reference is riddled with many teaching of functions used by ASP programs to make the operating system to their work (e.g. trace.IsEnabled, Trace.Write, .Row, .ToString). Additionally, the Microsoft reference has many examples of programs in C#, VB, Jscript, J#, and ASP.NET. These programming languages made by Microsoft are known for interfacing with the user and operating system to do work, and use the Windows APIs to do so. As such, the claimed Web application does interface with at least one said API.

8. As to the applicant’s arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 16 (including Claims 33) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting “multiple logger

streams are simultaneously active to log the events as the Web request is being serviced” the examiner respectfully disagrees. LogExplorer, p. 3 with Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, pgs. 5-6 was used to reject this limitation. LogExplorer teaches about collecting log information from multiple logs. This, combined with LogExplorer’s real-time monitoring of log data (streaming data) (LogExplorer, p. 19), teaches that multiple logger streams must be present in order to take in information from multiple logs at once. The citing in Microsoft make the log data of LogExplorer be the logged trace data concerning the events as the web request is being serviced.

9. As to the applicant’s arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 16 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting “an application trace entry and a server trace entry in an application trace log and a server trace log, respectfully” the examiner respectfully disagrees. A new interpretation of the Microsoft reference is being used to reject these limitations. See below. In summary, the server trace log is the application level tracing with the trace.axd (since Microsoft teaches it is on the server) and the application trace log is the page-level tracing for each page where the page is displayed at the client (browser) with trace information appended.

10. Regarding claim 36, the examiner would like to note that the claim recites “wherein the verbosity is determined by selecting...” not “wherein the level of verbosity is determined by selecting.” The applicant’s arguments regarding Claim 36 appear to be directed toward a level of verbosity being determined. If this is the case, the claim should recite this and the claim should be further amended for clarity since an earlier limitation in Claim 36 mentions that the level of verbosity is predetermined (not

determined). In response to the applicants arguments regarding Claim 36's indices being used for verbosity determination, Microsoft has several human-readable labels (e.g. Microsoft, pgs. 6-8) all under different indices (e.g. trace information, session state, etc.) and verbosity is determined using (or not using (based on level of verbosity)) these indices.

11. The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008, are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered rejected based on their respective rejections from at least a prior Office action (part(s) of recited again below).

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Objections***

12. Claims 1, 16, 26, and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the Web request" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- b. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the Web application" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- c. Claim 26 recites the limitation "the operating system" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- d. Claims 1, 16, and 36 recite "(Web request GUID)." The examiner is unsure if the applicant is trying to claim this parenthetical phrase.

e. Claim 36 is not indented properly according to 37 C.F.R 1.75(i) or MPEP 608.01(i)(i). The claims should be indented properly to clearly show what the entry comprises.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 36 lack a useful, concrete, and tangible result because the server module appears to be directed at software per se which is functional descriptive material per se that is non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

17. Claims 3, 4, 7, 9, 18, 19, 22, 24, and 27 recite the phrase "the trace log." The independent claims from which these claims depend from have two types of trace logs

(e.g. server trace logs and application trace logs). The phrase of “the trace log” is unclear because it is unclear what trace log the claim is referring to.

18. Claims 1, 11, 16, and 32 recite “and/or.” This phrase is unclear because the phrase could mean “and” and “or,” just “and” or just “or.”

19. A broad limitation together with a narrow limitation that falls within the broad limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 16 recites the broad recitation “executing the Web application that runs on or interfaces with a server,” and the claim also recites “from a Web application that is executing on the server” which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

22. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 13, 14, 32, 36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft, Tracing Overview, 2002, pages 1-8 (Microsoft) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,927 (Schaefer et al.).

For **Claim 1**, Microsoft teaches: “A method comprising:

- servicing a Web request from a Web application; [Microsoft, p. 1]
- ...with the Web request (Web request...), wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the Web request ..., [Microsoft, p. 6] wherein the servicing comprises executing the Web application that runs on

or interfaces with a server that is servicing the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6]

- ...detecting the occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web request during the execution of the Web application; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category with Microsoft p. 1] and
- logging by the server [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] a server entry having a server event ... [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e. counter")] in a server trace log [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] in response to the detecting of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request, [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the server entry comprises:
  - information descriptive of the occurrence of the event in the servicing of the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8]
  - an event ... corresponding to the event; [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e. counter")] and
  - the Web request ... corresponding to the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID)]
- logging by the Web application [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 2, (i.e. page level tracing)] an application entry having an application ... in an application trace log, [Microsoft, pgs. 6 and 7] wherein each application entry is correlated with each server entry in the server trace log; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details)] and
- determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate, as a

function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity” [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- “...associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) ...GUID.”

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- “...associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) ...GUID” [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft’s invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the

obvious advantage of being able to represent up to  $3.4 \times 10^{38}$  different numbers/requests (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

**Claim 3** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the entry is logged in the trace log during the servicing of the Web request only when the event is selected from the group consisting of:

- the event occurs within the context of a predetermined Universal Resource Locator (URL); [Microsoft, p. 5]
- the event pertains of the functionality of authentication;
- the event pertains of the functionality of security;
- the event pertains of the functionality of compression;
- the event pertains of the functionality of a Common Gateway Interface (CGI);
- the event pertains of the functionality of one or more filters."

**Claim 4** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein:

- the entry is logged in the trace log during the servicing of the Web request only when the event pertains to a predetermined filter; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e. trace property or trace context is defined in the configuration file] and
- the information comprises data going into the predetermined filter and data coming out of the predetermined filter" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

**Claim 6** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein at least one of the detecting and the logging are performed by one or more components of the operating system of a server” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

**Claim 7** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 6, wherein:

- the server services the Web request from the Web application; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]
- the operating system of the server comprises one or more Application Program Interfaces (APIs); [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]
- the Web application is executed by, or interfaces with, the server; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]
- the Web application interfaces with at least one said API to log a Web application event as a Web application entry in the trace log; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8]
- the Web application event occurs within the Web application itself; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and
- the Web application entry comprises:
  - information descriptive of the occurrence of the Web application event in the servicing of the Web request by the server when the Web application is running on, or interfacing with, the server; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and
  - the GUID (i.e., Microsoft’s session id associated with the web request with Schaefer’s GUID) corresponding to the Web request” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

**Claim 8** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein:

- a server having an operating system services the Web request from the Web application; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and
- at least one of the detecting and the logging are performed by one or more server applications that are executed by the server” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

**Claim 9’s** limitation(s) have already been met by Claim 7’s limitation(s).

Therefore, Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claim 7.

**Claim 10** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein filtering is performed on a URL basis” [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6].

**Claim 13** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the Web request GUID or the event GUID is the first portion of the entry” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e. the ID is part of the trace record information, first mentioned].

**Claim 14** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) as follows: “The method as defined in Claim 1, wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, and wherein the Web request GUID is 128 bit” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with Schaefer, col. 20, lines 40-42].

For **Claim 32**, Microsoft teaches: “A system having a processor for tracing a Web request on a network, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] the facility comprising:

- identifying means for identifying when a predetermined event occurs in a predetermined Web request when the predetermined Web request is being serviced; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category and various time stamps] and
- a logging means, in communication with the identifying means, for logging the event in a trace log as the event happens, [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 6] wherein the log of the event comprises: ... and information descriptive of the occurrence of the event when the predetermined Web request is being serviced, [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8] wherein the logging means is further for determining which of the information that is descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate, in the server or application trace log as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the level is selected from a plurality of verbosity levels" [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request."

With respect to Claim 32, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- "...a GUID corresponding to the predetermined Web request" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 with Microsoft, p. 6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to  $3.4 \times 10^{38}$  different numbers/requests (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

For **Claim 36**, Microsoft teaches: "A server module [Microsoft, p. 1] comprising:

- logic configured to service a Web request from a Web application; [Microsoft, p. 1]
- logic configured to detect an occurrence of an event in the servicing of the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category with Microsoft p. 1] and

- logic configured to log an entry in a server trace log, [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] wherein the entry comprises:
  - information descriptive of the occurrence of the event of the servicing of the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8] and
  - ...corresponding to the Web request (Web request...), wherein the Web request is associated with the Web request, so that events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the Web request... [Microsoft, p. 6] which is logged with each of the events; [Microsoft, p. 6] and
  - logic configured to determine which of the information descriptive of the occurrence of the event to put into the entry as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the verbosity is determined by selecting one of a plural of discrete indices, the indices corresponding to human-readable labels, [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom] wherein the descriptive information of the event comprises an event...and human readable text, and wherein event...may be correlated with Web request...” [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details)].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- “...a Global Unique Identifier (GUID)...GUID.”  
With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:
  - “...a Global Unique Identifier (GUID) ...GUID” [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and install it into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to  $3.4 \times 10^{38}$  different numbers/requests (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

**Claims 38 and 39** encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 3 and 4, respectfully, in addition to a server module and some logic for performing the method steps of Claims 3 and 4, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 38 and

39 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 3 and 4, respectfully.

23. Claims 11, 12, 16, 18-24, 26-31, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft, Tracing Overview, 2002, pages 1-8 (Microsoft) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,927 (Schaefer et al.), further in view of “Log Explorer Walkthrough” (LogExplorer).

For **Claim 11**, Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) teaches: “The method as defined in Claim 1, further comprising generating a report comprising at least a portion of the information in each said server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate for which the Web request or server event GUID in the entry..., wherein the amount of information in the report is a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 i.e., Microsoft teaches storing trace log information and the logs can be viewed as reports].

Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: “...matches a supplied ID.”

With respect to Claim 11, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches: “...matches a supplied ID [LogExplorer, pgs. 4 and 5].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of LogExplorer and Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) before him/her to combine LogExplorer with Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) because both inventions are directed towards loggin data.

LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer)'s invention because both inventions use log records containing data. Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) discloses a way to trace ASP events/requests comprising GUIDs. However, Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) does not expressly disclose reporting and matching on traces using a supplied ID. LogExplorer discloses a program comprising analyzing and reporting on log data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of LogExplorer and Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer) before him/her to take the filtering/analysis features based on an ID from LogExplorer and install it into the invention of Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer), thereby offering the obvious advantage of showing only log data that the user is interested in.

**Claim 12** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The method as defined in Claim 11, wherein:

- each said entry is in a binary format; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, all database management system keeps data in binary format internally since they are on computers] and
- the generating of the report further comprises using an event GUID corresponding to each said event to map the binary format of each said entry into an event description that is in a format that is human readable" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, Microsoft, p. 6].

For **Claim 16**, Microsoft teaches: “A computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method, [Microsoft, p. 1] the method comprising:

- ...with the Web request (Web request ...), wherein events which happen during servicing of the Web request can be identified by the Web request ..., [Microsoft, p. 6] wherein the servicing comprises executing the Web application that runs on or interfaces with a server that is servicing the Web request; [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6]
- servicing the Web request with a server from a Web application that is executing on the server, [Microsoft, pgs. 5 and 6]
- ...detecting the occurrence of the events during the servicing of the Web request by the server; [Microsoft, p. 6 i.e., an event in the trace category with Microsoft p. 1]
- logging by the server [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] each of the events as server entries in a server trace log, [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom] wherein each server entry comprises:
  - information descriptive of the occurrence of an event; [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8]
  - an event ... corresponding to the event; [Microsoft, p. 5 bottom (i.e. counter”)] and
  - the Web request ... corresponding to the Web request; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. session ID)]

- logging by the Web application [Microsoft, pgs. 1 and 2, (i.e. page level tracing)]  
an application entry having an application ... in an application trace log,  
[Microsoft, pgs. 6 and 7] wherein each application entry is correlated with each server entry in the server trace log; [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details)] and
- determining which of the descriptive information to put into the server entry and/or application entry, as appropriate, as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity" [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom].  
Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:
- "...associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) ...GUID
- ...wherein during the servicing multiple logger streams are simultaneously active to log the events as the Web request is being serviced by the server."

With respect to Claim 16, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches:

- "...associating a Globally Unique Identifier (GUID) ...GUID" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9]

Additionally, all GUIDs are mapped to [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9].

With respect to Claim 16, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches:

- "...wherein during the servicing multiple logger streams are simultaneously active to log the events as the Web request is being serviced by the server"  
[LogExplorer, p. 3 with Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, pgs. 5-6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teachings of Schaefer, LogExplorer's, and Microsoft before him/her

to combine Schaefer and LogExplorer's with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's and LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID or multiple logger streams. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction. LogExplorer discloses a program that tracks requests to a database comprising the ability to browse, export, report, and filter multiple log's log data

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and multiple logs from LogExplorer and install them into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of presenting a single virtual log file including transactions from all the log filesstreams included and the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to  $3.4 \times 10^{38}$  different numbers/requests by using GUIDs (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

**Claims 18 and 19's** limitation(s) have already been met by Claims 3 and 4's limitation(s), respectfully. Therefore, Claims 18 and 19 are rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claims 3 and 4, respectfully.

**Claim 20** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 16, wherein the steps further comprise at least one of:

- activating the logging when the logging is deactivated; [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] and
- deactivating the logging when the logging is activated" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

**Claim 21** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 20, wherein the activating and the deactivating are performed remotely from the server" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with LogExplorer, p. 3].

**Claim 22** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 20 wherein the trace log is in a remote location from the server" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with LogExplorer, p. 3].

**Claims 23, 24, and 26-30's** limitation(s) have already been met by Claims 6, 7, and 9-13's limitation(s), respectfully. Therefore, Claims 23, 24, and 26-30 are rejected for the same reason(s) as stated above with respect to Claims 6, 7, and 9-13, respectfully.

**Claim 31** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: "The computer-readable medium as defined in Claim 16,

wherein the Web request GUID is unique to the Web request with respect to other said Web requests, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8 with Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9] and wherein the Web request is for at least one of: a static file; a Common Gateway Interface (CGI); an active server page (ASP)" [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8].

For **Claim 33**, Microsoft teaches: "A network environment comprising a server having a processor ..., [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] the server servicing Web requests from a Web application [Microsoft, p. 1] while performing Web request-based tracing to produce traces [Microsoft, p. 6] ... and to flow each GUID from the server across to the application, [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8] wherein the traces comprise information that is descriptive of events which occur during the servicing of the Web request, [Microsoft, pgs. 6-8] wherein the information in the traces is determined in part as a function of a predetermined level of verbosity, wherein the level is selected from a plurality of levels of verbosity, [Microsoft, p. 5, bottom] and wherein the Web application can correlate each event with a GUID from the server" [Microsoft, p. 6 (i.e. view details)].

Microsoft discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "...and multiple simultaneously active logger streams that are concurrently running on the server and that are each trace-enabled  
...that comprise a GUID for each Web request."

With respect to Claim 33, an analogous art, LogExplorer, teaches: "...and multiple simultaneously active logger streams that are concurrently running on the server and that are each trace-enabled" [LogExplorer, p. 3 with Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, pgs. 5-6].

With respect to Claim 33, an analogous art, Schaefer, teaches: "...that comprise a GUID for each Web request" [Schaefer, col. 9, lines 8-9 with Microsoft, p. 6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teachings of Schaefer, LogExplorer's, and Microsoft before him/her to combine Schaefer and LogExplorer's with Microsoft because the inventions are directed towards logging activities.

Schaefer's and LogExplorer's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Microsoft's invention because the inventions use logs containing similar data. Microsoft discloses a way of tracing application usage comprising tracing and logging activities of web applications. However, Microsoft does not expressly disclose that an ID is a GUID or multiple logger streams. Schaefer discloses methods and apparatus for enabling a component in a first transaction processing environment to access a resource in another environment that is under the control of an XATMI compliant transaction manager comprising a GUID with a transaction. LogExplorer discloses a program that tracks requests to a database comprising the ability to browse, export, report, and filter multiple log's log data

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Schaefer and Microsoft before him/her to take the GUID from Schaefer and multiple logs from LogExplorer and install them into the invention of Microsoft, thereby offering the obvious advantage of presenting a single virtual log file including transactions from all the log filesstreams included and the obvious advantage of being able to represent up to  $3.4 \times 10^{38}$  different numbers/requests

by using GUIDs (by being 128 bits (or 16 bytes) in length by nature). For applications having many requests/transactions, this can be useful so as not to run out of identifiers for requests/transactions.

**Claim 35** can be mapped to Microsoft (as modified by Schaefer and LogExplorer) as follows: “The network environment as defined in Claim 33, wherein the server returns each said trace from the multiple logger streams to a corresponding said trace-enabled Web application for which the Web request was serviced by the server” [Microsoft, pgs. 1-8, specifically, p. 5 the trace.axd file].

***Conclusion***

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/B. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161